

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

In Re Application of:
Michael A. Gaul

Serial No.:
09/924,111

Filed:
August 7, 2001

For:
Interactive Program Guide Configuration
System

Confirmation No.: 9737

Examiner:
Peng, Fred H.
Group Art Unit:
2623

Docket No.:
A-7172

APPEAL BRIEF UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 41.37

Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This Appeal Brief under 37 C.F.R. § 41.37 is submitted in support of the Notice of Appeal filed on November 7, 2008, responding to the final Office Action mailed August 7, 2008 (Part of Paper No./Mail Date 20080801).

I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The real party in interest of the instant application is Scientific-Atlanta, Inc., having its principal place of business at 5030 Sugarloaf Parkway, Lawrenceville, GA 30044. Scientific-Atlanta, Inc., the assignee of record, is wholly owned by Cisco Systems, Inc.

II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

There are no related appeals or interferences.

III. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

Claims 1-3, 6, 10-23, 26, 30-36, 39, 43-48, 51 and 57-74 stand finally rejected by the Office Action mailed August 7, 2008, and are the subject of this appeal. Claims 4-5, 7-9, 24-25, 27-29, 37-38, 40-42, 49-50, and 52-56 were cancelled during prosecution.

IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

There have been no claim amendments made after the final Office Action, and all amendments made before the final Office Action have been entered. The claim listing in section VIII (below) represents the present state of the claims.

V. SUMMARY OF THE CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

Embodiments of the claimed subject matter are summarized below with reference numbers and references to the written description ("specification") and drawings. The subject matter described below appears in the original disclosure at least where indicated, and may further appear in other places within the original disclosure.

Embodiments of the claimed subject matter, such as those defined by independent claim 1, define a system for providing interactive media services. The system comprises memory (see, e.g., p. 7 lines 5-25; p. 8 line 30 to p. 9, line 35; and FIG. 1, ref. nums. 51 and 52) for storing interactive program guide (IPG) configuration data (see, e.g., p. 10 lines 30-35; and p. 13 lines 5-15 and 20-25) that is used to determine an IPG channel listing characteristic (see, e.g., p. 12 lines 10-15) where the channel listing characteristic comprises a predetermined number of channels presented concurrently (see, e.g., p. 13 line 25 to p. 14 line 15). The system also comprises logic configured to modify the IPG configuration data (see, e.g., p. 10 lines 30-35) in response to a first user input requesting a change in the IPG channel listing characteristic (see, e.g., p. 12 lines 5-25), wherein the IPG channel listing characteristic is represented by an object indicia presented to a user (see, e.g., p. 12 lines 5-25; and FIG. 4, ref. nums. 118, 119, and 120) and an action for reconfiguring the IPG channel listing characteristic is represented by a tool indicia presented to the user (see, e.g., p. 12 lines 5-25; and FIG. 4, ref. nums. 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, and 117) such that a first user input of selecting the object indicia and the tool indicia modifies the IPG channel listing characteristic (see, e.g., p. 12 lines 5-25).

Embodiments of the claimed subject matter, such as those defined by independent claim 6, define a system for providing interactive media services. The system comprises memory (see, e.g., p. 7 lines 5-25; p. 8 line 30 to p. 9, line 35; and FIG. 1, ref. nums. 51 and 52) for storing interactive program guide (IPG) configuration data (see, e.g., p. 10, lines 30-35; and p. 13 lines 5-15 and 20-25) that is used to determine an IPG time listing characteristic (see, e.g., p. 12 lines 10-15) where the time listing characteristic is at least one of the following: a predetermined number of time listings presented concurrently (see, e.g., p. 14 line 15 to p. 15, line 20) and a predetermined coverage of a time listing (see, e.g., p. 16 line 15 to p. 17, line 20). The system also comprises logic configured to modify the IPG configuration data (see, e.g., p. 10 lines 30-35) in response to a first user input requesting a change in the IPG time listing characteristic (see, e.g., p. 12 lines 5-25), wherein the IPG time listing characteristic is represented by an object indicia presented to a user (see, e.g., p. 12 lines 5-25; and FIG. 4, ref. nums. 118, 119, and 120) and an action for reconfiguring the IPG time listing characteristic is represented by a tool indicia presented to the user (see, e.g., p. 12 lines 5-25; and FIG. 4, ref. nums. 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, and 117) such that a first user input of selecting the object indicia and the tool indicia modifies the IPG time listing characteristic (see, e.g., p. 12 lines 5-25).

Embodiments of the claimed subject matter, such as those defined by independent claim 17, define a method for configuring a user interface. The method comprises receiving a first user input requesting a change in an interactive program guide (IPG) channel listing characteristic (see, e.g., p. 12 lines 5-25) where the channel listing characteristic comprises a predetermined number of channels presented concurrently (see, e.g., p. 13 line 25 to p. 14 line 15). The method also comprises modifying IPG configuration data (see, e.g., p. 10 lines 30-35; and p. 13 lines 5-15 and 20-25) stored in memory (see, e.g., p. 7 lines 5-25; p. 8 line 30 to p. 9, line 35; and FIG. 1, ref. nums. 51 and 52) in response to receiving the first user input (see, e.g., p. 12 lines 5-25), where the IPG configuration data is used to determine the IPG channel listing

characteristic (see, e.g., p. 12, lines 10-15), wherein the IPG channel listing characteristic is represented by an object indicia presented to a user (see, e.g., p. 12 lines 5-25; and FIG. 4, ref. nums. 118, 119, and 120) and an action for reconfiguring the IPG channel listing characteristic is represented by a tool indicia presented to the user (see, e.g., p. 12 lines 5-25; and FIG. 4, ref. nums. 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, and 117) such that a first user input of selecting the object indicia and the tool indicia modifies the IPG channel listing characteristic (see, e.g., p. 12 lines 5-25).

Embodiments of the claimed subject matter, such as those defined by independent claim 26, define a method for configuring a user interface. The method comprises receiving a first user input requesting a change in an interactive program guide (IPG) time listing characteristic (see, e.g., p. 12 lines 5-25) where the time listing characteristic is at least one of the following: a predetermined number of time listings presented concurrently (see, e.g., p. 14 line 15 to p. 15, line 20) and a predetermined coverage of a time listing (see, e.g., p. 16 line 15 to p. 17, line 20). The method also comprises modifying IPG configuration data (see, e.g., p. 10 lines 30-35; and p. 13 lines 5-15 and 20-25) stored in memory (see, e.g., p. 7 lines 5-25; p. 8 line 30 to p. 9, line 35; and FIG. 1, ref. nums. 51 and 52) in response to receiving the first user input (see, e.g., p. 12 lines 5-25), where the IPG configuration data is used to determine the IPG time listing characteristic (see, e.g., p. 12, lines 10-15), wherein the IPG time listing characteristic is represented by an object indicia presented to a user (see, e.g., p. 12 lines 5-25; and FIG. 4, ref. nums. 118, 119, and 120) and an action for reconfiguring the IPG time listing characteristic is represented by a tool indicia presented to the user (see, e.g., p. 12 lines 5-25; and FIG. 4, ref. nums. 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, and 117) such that a first user input of selecting the object indicia and the tool indicia modifies the IPG time listing characteristic (see, e.g., p. 12 lines 5-25).

Embodiments of the claimed subject matter, such as those defined by independent claim 30, define a method for configuring a user interface. The method comprises receiving a

first user input requesting a change in an interactive program guide (IPG) channel listing characteristic (see, e.g., p. 12 lines 5-25), where the channel listing characteristic comprises a predetermined number of channels presented concurrently (see, e.g., p. 14 line 15 to p. 15, line 20). The method also comprises changing the IPG channel listing characteristic (see, e.g., p. 10 lines 30-35; and p. 13 lines 5-15 and 20-25) in accordance with the first user input (see, e.g., p. 12 lines 5-25), wherein the IPG channel listing characteristic is represented by an object indicia presented to a user (see, e.g., p. 12 lines 5-25; and FIG. 4, ref. nums. 118, 119, and 120) and an action for reconfiguring the IPG channel listing characteristic is represented by a tool indicia presented to the user (see, e.g., p. 12 lines 5-25; and FIG. 4, ref. nums. 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, and 117) such that a first user input of selecting the object indicia and the tool indicia modifies the IPG channel listing characteristic (see, e.g., p. 12 lines 5-25).

Embodiments of the claimed subject matter, such as those defined by independent claim 39, define a method for configuring a user interface. The method comprises receiving a first user input requesting a change in an interactive program guide (IPG) time listing characteristic (see, e.g., p. 12 lines 5-25), where the time listing characteristic is at least one of the following: a predetermined number of time listings presented concurrently and a predetermined coverage of a time listing (see, e.g., p. 14 line 15 to p. 15, line 20) and a predetermined coverage of a time listing (see, e.g., p. 16 line 15 to p. 17, line 20). The method also comprises changing the IPG time listing characteristic (see, e.g., p. 10 lines 30-35; and p. 13 lines 5-15 and 20-25) in accordance with the first user input (see, e.g., p. 12 lines 5-25), wherein the IPG time listing characteristic is represented by an object indicia presented to a user (see, e.g., p. 12 lines 5-25; and FIG. 4, ref. nums. 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, and 117) and an action for reconfiguring the IPG time listing characteristic is represented by a tool indicia presented to the user (see, e.g., p. 12 lines 5-25; and FIG. 4, ref. nums. 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, and 117) such that a first user input of selecting the object indicia and the tool indicia modifies the IPG time listing characteristic (see, e.g., p. 12 lines 5-25).

Embodiments of the claimed subject matter, such as those defined by independent claim 43, define a method for configuring a user interface. The method comprises receiving a first user input identifying an interactive program guide (IPG) channel listing characteristic (see, e.g., p. 12 lines 5-25), where the channel listing characteristic comprises a predetermined number of channels presented concurrently (see, e.g., p. 14 line 15 to p. 15, line 20). The method also comprises providing the user with an IPG screen that has the characteristic identified via the first user input (see, e.g., p. 13, line 1-10 and 20-25), wherein the IPG channel listing characteristic is represented by an object indicia presented to a user (see, e.g., p. 12 lines 5-25; FIG. 4, ref. nums. 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, and 117) and an action for reconfiguring the IPG channel listing characteristic is represented by a tool indicia presented to the user (see, e.g., p. 12 lines 5-25; and FIG. 4, ref. nums. 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, and 117) such that a first user input of selecting the object indicia and the tool indicia modifies the IPG channel listing characteristic (see, e.g., p. 12 lines 5-25).

Embodiments of the claimed subject matter, such as those defined by independent claim 51, define a method for configuring a user interface. The method comprises receiving a first user input identifying an interactive program guide (IPG) time listing characteristic (see, e.g., p. 12 lines 5-25), where the time listing characteristic is at least one of the following: a predetermined number of time listings presented concurrently (see, e.g., p. 14 line 15 to p. 15, line 20) and a predetermined coverage of a time listing (see, e.g., p. 16 line 15 to p. 17, line 20). The method also comprise providing the user with an IPG screen that has the characteristic identified via the first user input (see, e.g., p. 13, line 1-10 and 20-25), wherein the IPG time listing characteristic is represented by an object indicia presented to a user (see, e.g., p. 12 lines 5-25; and FIG. 4, ref. nums. 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, and 117) and an action for reconfiguring the IPG time listing characteristic is represented by a tool indicia presented to the user (see, e.g., p. 12 lines 5-25; and FIG. 4, ref. nums. 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, and 117) such

that a first user input of selecting the object indicia and the tool indicia modifies the IPG time listing characteristic (see, e.g., p. 12 lines 5-25).

VI. GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

The following grounds of rejection are to be reviewed on appeal.

A. Claims 1-3, 6, 10-14, 17-23, 26, 30-36, 39, 43-48, 51, and 55-74 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by *Ward et al.* (U.S. Pub. No. 2007/0186240).

B. Claims 15 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Ward et al.* (U.S. Pub. No. 2007/0186240) in view of *Lemmons et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,442,755).

VII. ARGUMENT

A. Rejection of Claims 1-3, 6, 10-14, 17-23, 26, 30-36, 39, 43-48, 51, and 55-74 under 35 U.S.C. §102: *Ward et al.*

1. Independent Claim 1

Appellant submits that claim 1 is not anticipated by *Ward et al.* for at least the following reasons. For a proper rejection of a claim under 35 U.S.C. §102, the cited reference must disclose, teach, or suggest all elements/features/steps of the claim at issue. See, e.g., *E.I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. v. Phillips Petroleum Co.*, 849 F.2d 1430, 7 U.S.P.Q.2d 1129 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

a. *Ward et al.* does not teach

“memory for storing interactive program guide (IPG) configuration data that is used to determine an IPG channel listing characteristic”

The final Office Action alleges (p. 3) that the “look of the EPG/IPG information displayed” discussed in Para. 0028 of *Ward et al.* corresponds “an IPG channel listing characteristic”. Appellant assumes (for the sake of argument) that this allegation is true. The final Office Action (p. 3) further alleges that “software instructions” in *Ward et al.* correspond to the claimed “interactive program guide (IPG) configuration data” used to determine this IPG look. Appellant

disagrees. Configuration data is not the same as instructions, and the final Office Action has offered no explanation why the two are the same or would be interpreted as the same. Thus, *Ward et al.* does not disclose, teach, or suggest all elements of claim 1, and the rejection should be overturned.

**b. *Ward et al.* does not teach
“logic configured to modify the IPG configuration data in response to a first
user input requesting a change in the IPG channel listing characteristic...”**

It is unclear to Appellant which features in *Ward et al.* allegedly correspond to this claimed feature, since the final Office Action did not provide any citations to *Ward et al.* for this particular feature. However, the final Office Action (p. 3) does refer to FIG. 1 and FIG. 6 of *Ward et al.* in discussing claim language which follows this feature (“wherein the IPG channel listing characteristic is represented...”). Therefore, Appellant assumes that the rejection applies FIGs. 1 and 6 of *Ward et al.* to this initial “modify the IPG configuration data” claim language also.

FIG. 6 of *Ward et al.* is directed to a schedule of programs to be recorded. After selecting the Schedule button, the user may remove or change programs on the record list by selecting the Remove or Change buttons, respectively. (*Ward et al.*, para. 0121.) The final Office Action (p. 3) appears to allege that this removal/change feature teaches “logic configured to modify the IPG configuration data in response to a first user input requesting a change in the IPG channel listing characteristic”. Appellant disagrees.

As stated above in section VII.A.1.a, the final Office Action alleges that the “look of the EPG/IPG information displayed” in *Ward et al.* corresponds to the claimed “IPG configuration data”. However, Appellant submits that removing or changing programs on the record list changes the content rather than the look of the EPG/IPG (using the language of the Office Action). Therefore, *Ward et al.* does not teach “logic configured to modify the IPG configuration data...”. Similarly, a user removing or changing a scheduled recording is best understood as user input requesting a change in the programs to be recorded, not user input requesting a

change in the look of the EPG (“channel listing characteristic”). Therefore, *Ward et al.* does not teach “a first user input requesting a change in the IPG channel listing characteristic”. Since the final Office Action has not shown that *Ward et al.* discloses, teaches, or suggests all elements of claim 1, the rejection should be overturned.

c. *Ward et al.* does not teach

“...wherein the IPG channel listing characteristic is represented by an object indicia presented to the a user and an action for reconfiguring the IPG channel listing characteristic is represented by a tool indicia presented to the user such that a first user input of selecting the object indicia and the tool indicia modifies the IPG channel listing characteristic”

The final Office Action alleges (p. 3) that the Schedule button (shown in FIG. 6) appearing on the action bar (ref. num. 20 in FIG. 1) of *Ward et al.* correspond to the claimed object indicia. The final Office Action also alleges (p. 3) that the Remove/Change buttons (shown in FIG. 6) appearing on the navigation bar (ref. num. 18 in FIG. 6) correspond to the claimed tool indicia. Appellant disagrees. As discussed above in section VII.A.1.b, FIG. 6 of *Ward et al.* illustrates removing or changing the content of, rather than the look of the EPG/IPG (using the language of the Office Action).

Appellant assumes (for the sake of argument) that the schedule of recordings in FIG. 6 corresponds to an “IPG channel listing”, and that the Watch/Record Schedule button is an object indicia. Even so, Appellant submits that the Watch/Record Schedule button represents the schedule itself, and not the look of the schedule – *i.e.*, the button represents the channel listing, not the channel listing characteristic. In contrast, claim 1 recites that the object indicia represents the IPG channel listing characteristic.

Similarly, the Remove or Change button represents an action for reconfiguring the schedule itself, not an action for reconfiguring the look of the schedule – the channel listing, not the channel listing characteristic. In contrast, claim 1 recites that the tool indicia represents an action for reconfiguring the IPG channel listing characteristic. Since the final Office Action has

not shown that *Ward et al.* discloses, teaches, or suggests all elements of claim 1, the rejection should be overturned.

2. Independent Claim 6

Appellant submits that claim 6 is not anticipated by *Ward et al.* for at least the following reasons. For a proper rejection of a claim under 35 U.S.C. §102, the cited reference must disclose, teach, or suggest all elements/features/steps of the claim at issue. See, e.g., *E.I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. v. Phillips Petroleum Co.*, 849 F.2d 1430, 7 U.S.P.Q.2d 1129 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

a. *Ward et al.* does not teach

“memory for storing interactive program guide (IPG) configuration data that is used to determine an IPG time listing characteristic”

The final Office Action alleges (p. 4) that the “look of the EPG/IPG time information displayed” discussed in Para. 0028 of *Ward et al.* corresponds “an IPG time listing characteristic”. Appellant assumes (for the sake of argument) that this allegation is true. The final Office Action (p. 4) further alleges that “software instructions” in *Ward et al.* correspond to the “interactive program guide (IPG) configuration data” used to determine this IPG look. Appellant disagrees. Configuration data is not the same as instructions, and the final Office Action has offered no explanation why the two are the same or would be interpreted as the same. Thus, *Ward et al.* does not disclose, teach, or suggest all elements of claim 6, and the rejection should be overturned.

b. *Ward et al.* does not teach

“logic configured to modify the IPG configuration data in response to a first user input requesting a change in the IPG time listing characteristic...”

It is unclear to Appellant which features in *Ward et al.* allegedly correspond to this feature, since the final Office Action did not provide any citations to *Ward et al.* for this particular feature. However, the final Office Action (p. 4) does refer to FIG. 1 and FIG. 6 of *Ward et al.* in discussing claim language which follows this feature (“wherein the IPG time listing characteristic

is represented...”). Therefore, Appellant assumes that the rejection applies FIGs. 1 and 6 of *Ward et al.* to this initial “modify the IPG configuration data” claim language also.

FIG. 6 of *Ward et al.* is directed to a schedule of programs to be recorded. After selecting the Schedule button, the user may remove or change programs on the record list by selecting the Remove or Change buttons, respectively. (*Ward et al.*, para. 0121.) The final Office Action (p. 4) appears to allege that this removal/change feature teaches “logic configured to modify the IPG configuration data in response to a first user input requesting a change in the IPG time listing characteristic”. Appellant disagrees.

As stated above in section VII.A.2.a, the final Office Action alleges that the “look of the EPG/IPG time information displayed” in *Ward et al.* corresponds to the claimed “IPG configuration data”. However, Appellant submits that removing or changing programs on the record list changes the content rather than the look of the EPG/IPG (using the language of the Office Action). Therefore, *Ward et al.* does not teach “logic configured to modify the IPG configuration data...”. Similarly, a user removing or changing a scheduled recording is best understood as user input requesting a change in the programs to be recorded, not user input requesting a change in the look of the EPG (“channel listing characteristic”). Therefore, *Ward et al.* does not teach “a first user input requesting a change in the IPG time listing characteristic”. Since the final Office Action has not shown that *Ward et al.* discloses, teaches, or suggests all elements of claim 6, the rejection should be overturned.

c. *Ward et al.* does not teach

“...wherein the IPG time listing characteristic is represented by an object indicia presented to the a user and an action for reconfiguring the IPG time listing characteristic is represented by a tool indicia presented to the user such that a first user input of selecting the object indicia and the tool indicia modifies the IPG time listing characteristic”

The final Office Action alleges (p. 4) that the Schedule button (shown in FIG. 6) appearing on the action bar (ref. num. 20 in FIG. 1) of *Ward et al.* correspond to the claimed object indicia. The final Office Action also alleges (p. 3) that the Remove/Change buttons

(shown in FIG. 6) appearing on the navigation bar (ref. num. 18 in FIG. 6) correspond to the claimed tool indicia. As discussed above in section VII.A.1.b, FIG. 6 of *Ward et al.* describes removing or changing the content of, rather than the look of the EPG/IPG (using the language of the Office Action).

Appellant assumes (for the sake of argument) that the schedule of recordings in FIG. 6 corresponds to an “IPG time listing”, and that the Watch/Record Schedule button is an object indicia. Even so, Appellant submits that the Watch/Record Schedule button represents the schedule itself, and not the look of the schedule – *i.e.*, the button represents the time listing, not the time listing characteristic. In contrast, claim 6 recites that the object indicia represents the IPG time listing characteristic.

Similarly, the Remove or Change button represents an action for reconfiguring the schedule itself, not an action for reconfiguring the look of the schedule – the time listing, not the time listing characteristic. In contrast, claim 6 recites that the tool indicia represents an action for reconfiguring the IPG channel listing characteristic. Since the final Office Action has not shown that *Ward et al.* discloses, teaches, or suggests all elements of claim 6, the rejection should be overturned.

3. Independent Claim 17

Appellant submits that claim 17 is not anticipated by *Ward et al.* for at least the following reasons. For a proper rejection of a claim under 35 U.S.C. §102, the cited reference must disclose, teach, or suggest all elements/features/steps of the claim at issue. *See, e.g., E.I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. v. Phillips Petroleum Co.*, 849 F.2d 1430, 7 U.S.P.Q.2d 1129 (Fed. Cir. 1988).teach, or suggest all elements/features/steps of the claim at issue. *See, e.g., E.I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. v. Phillips Petroleum Co.*, 849 F.2d 1430, 7 U.S.P.Q.2d 1129 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

**a. *Ward et al.* does not teach
“IPG configuration data stored in memory...used to determine the IPG channel listing characteristic”**

The final Office Action alleges (p. 3) that the “look of the EPG/IPG information displayed” discussed in Para. 0028 of *Ward et al.* corresponds “the IPG channel listing characteristic”. Appellant assumes (for the sake of argument) that this allegation is true. The final Office Action (p. 3) further alleges that “software instructions” in *Ward et al.* correspond to the “IPG configuration data stored in memory” used to determine this IPG look. Appellant disagrees. Configuration data is not the same as instructions, and the final Office Action has offered no explanation why the two are the same or would be interpreted as the same. Thus, *Ward et al.* does not disclose, teach, or suggest all elements of claim 17, and the rejection should be overturned.

**b. *Ward et al.* does not teach
“modifying IPG configuration data...in response to receiving the first user input”**

It is unclear to Appellant which features in *Ward et al.* allegedly correspond to this feature, since the final Office Action did not provide any citations to *Ward et al.* for this particular feature. However, the final Office Action (p. 3) does refer to FIG. 1 and FIG. 6 of *Ward et al.* in discussing claim language which follows this feature (“wherein the IPG channel listing characteristic is represented...”). Therefore, Appellant assumes that the rejection applies FIGs. 1 and 6 of *Ward et al.* to this initial “modifying IPG configuration data” claim language also.

FIG. 6 of *Ward et al.* is directed to a schedule of programs to be recorded. After selecting the Schedule button, the user may remove or change programs on the record list by selecting the Remove or Change buttons, respectively. (*Ward et al.*, para. 0121.) The final Office Action (p. 3) appears to allege that this removal/change feature teaches “modifying IPG configuration data in response to a first user input”. Appellant disagrees.

As stated above in section VII.A.3.a, the final Office Action alleges that the “look of the EPG/IPG information displayed” in *Ward et al.* corresponds to the claimed “IPG configuration data”. However, Appellant submits that removing or changing programs on the record list changes the content rather than the look of the EPG/IPG (using the language of the Office Action). Therefore, *Ward et al.* does not teach ““modifying IPG configuration data”. Similarly, a user removing or changing a scheduled recording is best understood as user input requesting a change in the programs to be recorded, not user input requesting a change in the look of the EPG (“channel listing characteristic”). Therefore, *Ward et al.* does not teach modifying “in response to receiving the first user input” where claim 17 further defines “first user input” as “requesting a change in an interactive program guide (IPG) channel listing characteristic”. Since the final Office Action has not shown that *Ward et al.* discloses, teaches, or suggests all elements of claim 17, the rejection should be overturned.

c. *Ward et al.* does not teach

“...wherein the IPG channel listing characteristic is represented by an object indicia presented to the a user and an action for reconfiguring the IPG channel listing characteristic is represented by a tool indicia presented to the user such that a first user input of selecting the object indicia and the tool indicia modifies the IPG channel listing characteristic”

The final Office Action alleges (p. 3) that the Schedule button (shown in FIG. 6) appearing on the action bar (ref. num. 20 in FIG. 1) of *Ward et al.* correspond to the claimed object indicia. The final Office Action also alleges (p. 3) that the Remove/Change buttons (shown in FIG. 6) appearing on the navigation bar (ref. num. 18 in FIG. 6) correspond to the claimed tool indicia. Appellant disagrees. As discussed above in section VII.A.3.a, FIG. 6 of *Ward et al.* describes removing or changing the content of, rather than the look of the EPG/IPG (using the language of the Office Action).

Appellant assumes (for the sake of argument) that the schedule of recordings in FIG. 6 corresponds to an “IPG channel listing”, and that the Watch/Record Schedule button is an object indicia. Even so, Appellant submits that the Watch/Record Schedule button represents

the schedule itself, and not the look of the schedule – *i.e.*, the button represents the channel listing, not the channel listing characteristic. In contrast, claim 17 recites that the object indicia represents the IPG channel listing characteristic.

Similarly, the Remove or Change button represents an action for reconfiguring the schedule itself, not an action for reconfiguring the look of the schedule – the channel listing, not the channel listing characteristic. In contrast, claim 17 recites that the tool indicia represents an action for reconfiguring the IPG channel listing characteristic. Since the final Office Action has not shown that *Ward et al.* discloses, teaches, or suggests all elements of claim 17, the rejection should be overturned.

4. Independent Claim 26

Appellant submits that claim 26 is not anticipated by *Ward et al.* for at least the following reasons. For a proper rejection of a claim under 35 U.S.C. §102, the cited reference must disclose, teach, or suggest all elements/features/steps of the claim at issue. *See, e.g., E.I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. v. Phillips Petroleum Co.*, 849 F.2d 1430, 7 U.S.P.Q.2d 1129 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

a. *Ward et al.* does not teach “IPG configuration data stored in memory...used to determine the IPG channel listing characteristic”

The final Office Action alleges (p. 4) that the “look of the EPG/IPG information displayed” discussed in Para. 0028 of *Ward et al.* corresponds “an IPG channel listing characteristic”. Appellant assumes (for the sake of argument) that this allegation is true. The final Office Action (p. 4) further alleges that “software instructions” in *Ward et al.* correspond to the claimed “interactive program guide (IPG) configuration data” used to determine this IPG look. Appellant disagrees. Configuration data is not the same as instructions, and the final Office Action has offered no explanation why the two are the same or would be interpreted as the same. Thus, *Ward et al.* does not disclose, teach, or suggest all elements of claim 26, and the rejection should be overturned.

**b. *Ward et al.* does not teach
“modifying IPG configuration data...in response to receiving the first user
input”**

It is unclear to Appellant which features in *Ward et al.* allegedly correspond to this feature, since the final Office Action did not provide any citations to *Ward et al.* for this particular feature. However, the final Office Action (p. 4) does refer to FIG. 1 and FIG. 6 of *Ward et al.* in discussing claim language which follows this feature (“wherein the IPG channel listing characteristic is represented...”). Therefore, Appellant assumes that the rejection applies FIGs. 1 and 6 of *Ward et al.* to this initial “modifying IPG configuration data” claim language also.

FIG. 6 of *Ward et al.* is directed to a schedule of programs to be recorded. After selecting the Schedule button, the user may remove or change programs on the record list by selecting the Remove or Change buttons, respectively. (*Ward et al.*, para. 0121.) The final Office Action (p. 4) appears to allege that this removal/change feature teaches “modifying IPG configuration data...in response to receiving the first user input”. Appellant disagrees.

As stated above in section VII.A.4.a, the final Office Action alleges that the “look of the EPG/IPG information displayed” in *Ward et al.* corresponds to the claimed “IPG configuration data”. However, Appellant submits that removing or changing programs on the record list changes the content rather than the look of the EPG/IPG (using the language of the Office Action). Therefore, *Ward et al.* does not teach “logic configured to modify the IPG configuration data...”. Similarly, a user removing or changing a scheduled recording is best understood as user input requesting a change in the programs to be recorded, not user input requesting a change in the look of the EPG (“channel listing characteristic”). Therefore, *Ward et al.* does not teach modifying “in response to receiving the first user input” where where claim 26 further defines “first user input” as “requesting a change in an interactive program guide (IPG) channel listing characteristic”. Since the final Office Action has not shown that *Ward et al.* discloses, teaches, or suggests all elements of claim 26, the rejection should be overturned.

c. *Ward et al.* does not teach

“...wherein the IPG channel listing characteristic is represented by an object indicia presented to the a user and an action for reconfiguring the IPG channel listing characteristic is represented by a tool indicia presented to the user such that a first user input of selecting the object indicia and the tool indicia modifies the IPG channel listing characteristic”

The final Office Action alleges (p. 4) that the Schedule button (shown in FIG. 6) appearing on the action bar (ref. num. 20 in FIG. 1) of *Ward et al.* correspond to the claimed object indicia. The final Office Action also alleges (p. 3) that the Remove/Change buttons (shown in FIG. 6) appearing on the navigation bar (ref. num. 18 in FIG. 6) correspond to the claimed tool indicia. As discussed above in section VII.A.4.b, FIG. 6 of *Ward et al.* describes removing or changing the content of, rather than the look of the EPG/IPG (using the language of the Office Action).

Appellant assumes (for the sake of argument) that the schedule of recordings in FIG. 6 corresponds to an “IPG channel listing”, and that the Watch/Record Schedule button is an object indicia. Even so, Appellant submits that the Watch/Record Schedule button represents the schedule itself, and not the look of the schedule – *i.e.*, the button represents the channel listing, not the channel listing characteristic. In contrast, claim 26 recites that the object indicia represents the IPG channel listing characteristic.

Similarly, the Remove or Change button represents an action for reconfiguring the schedule itself, not an action for reconfiguring the look of the schedule – the channel listing, not the channel listing characteristic. In contrast, claim 26 recites that the tool indicia represents an action for reconfiguring the IPG channel listing characteristic. Since the final Office Action has not shown that *Ward et al.* discloses, teaches, or suggests all elements of claim 26, the rejection should be overturned.

5. Independent Claim 30

Appellant submits that claim 30 is not anticipated by *Ward et al.* for at least the following reasons. For a proper rejection of a claim under 35 U.S.C. §102, the cited reference must

disclose, teach, or suggest all elements/features/steps of the claim at issue. See, e.g., *E.I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. v. Phillips Petroleum Co.*, 849 F.2d 1430, 7 U.S.P.Q.2d 1129 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

**a. *Ward et al.* does not teach
“changing the IPG channel listing characteristic in accordance with the first
user input”**

It is unclear to Appellant which features in *Ward et al.* allegedly correspond to this feature, since the final Office Action did not provide any citations to *Ward et al.* for this particular feature. However, the final Office Action (p. 3) does refer to FIG. 1 and FIG. 6 of *Ward et al.* in discussing claim language which follows this feature (“wherein the IPG channel listing characteristic is represented...”). Therefore, Appellant assumes that the rejection applies FIGs. 1 and 6 of *Ward et al.* to this initial “changing the IPG channel listing characteristic” claim language also.

FIG. 6 of *Ward et al.* is directed to a schedule of programs to be recorded. After selecting the Schedule button, the user may remove or change programs on the record list by selecting the Remove or Change buttons, respectively. (*Ward et al.*, para. 0121.) The final Office Action (p. 4) appears to allege that this removal/change feature teaches “modifying IPG configuration data...in response to receiving the first user input”. Appellant disagrees.

The final Office Action alleges (p. 3) that the “look of the EPG/IPG information displayed” discussed in Para. 0028 of *Ward et al.* corresponds to the claimed “IPG channel listing characteristic”. Appellant assumes (for the sake of argument) that this allegation is true. However, Appellant submits that removing or changing programs on the record list changes the content rather than the look of the EPG/IPG (using the language of the Office Action). Therefore, *Ward et al.* does not teach “changing the IPG channel listing characteristic”. Similarly, a user removing or changing a scheduled recording is best understood as user input requesting a change in the programs to be recorded, not user input requesting a change in the look of the EPG (“channel listing characteristic”). Therefore, *Ward et al.* does not teach

modifying “in response to receiving the first user input” where claim 30 further defines “first user input” as “requesting a change in an interactive program guide (IPG) channel listing characteristic”. Since the final Office Action has not shown that *Ward et al.* discloses, teaches, or suggests all elements of claim 30, the rejection should be overturned.

b. *Ward et al.* does not teach

“...wherein the IPG channel listing characteristic is represented by an object indicia presented to a user and an action for reconfiguring the IPG channel listing characteristic is represented by a tool indicia presented to the user such that a first user input of selecting the object indicia and the tool indicia modifies the IPG channel listing characteristic”

The final Office Action alleges (p. 3) that the Schedule button (shown in FIG. 6) appearing on the action bar (ref. num. 20 in FIG. 1) of *Ward et al.* correspond to the claimed object indicia. The final Office Action also alleges (p. 3) that the Remove/Change buttons (shown in FIG. 6) appearing on the navigation bar (ref. num. 18 in FIG. 6) correspond to the claimed tool indicia. As discussed above in section VII.A.5.a, FIG. 6 of *Ward et al.* describes removing or changing the content of, rather than the look of the EPG/IPG (using the language of the Office Action).

Appellant assumes (for the sake of argument) that the schedule of recordings in FIG. 6 corresponds to an “IPG channel listing”, and that the Watch/Record Schedule button is an object indicia. Even so, Appellant submits that the Watch/Record Schedule button represents the schedule itself, and not the look of the schedule – *i.e.*, the button represents the channel listing, not the channel listing characteristic. In contrast, claim 30 recites that the object indicia represents the IPG channel listing characteristic.

Similarly, the Remove or Change button represents an action for reconfiguring the schedule itself, not an action for reconfiguring the look of the schedule – the channel listing, not the channel listing characteristic. In contrast, claim 30 recites that the tool indicia represents an action for reconfiguring the IPG channel listing characteristic. Since the final Office Action has

not shown that *Ward et al.* discloses, teaches, or suggests all elements of claim 30, the rejection should be overturned.

6. Independent Claim 39

Appellant submits that claim 39 is not anticipated by *Ward et al.* for at least the following reasons. For a proper rejection of a claim under 35 U.S.C. §102, the cited reference must disclose, teach, or suggest all elements/features/steps of the claim at issue. See, e.g., *E.I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. v. Phillips Petroleum Co.*, 849 F.2d 1430, 7 U.S.P.Q.2d 1129 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

a. *Ward et al.* does not teach “changing the IPG time listing characteristic in accordance with the first user input”

It is unclear to Appellant which features in *Ward et al.* allegedly correspond to this feature, since the final Office Action did not provide any citations to *Ward et al.* for this particular feature. However, the final Office Action (p. 4) does refer to FIG. 1 and FIG. 6 of *Ward et al.* in discussing claim language which follows this feature (“wherein the IPG time listing characteristic is represented...”). Therefore, Appellant assumes that the rejection applies FIGs. 1 and 6 of *Ward et al.* to this initial “changing the IPG time listing characteristic” claim language also.

FIG. 6 of *Ward et al.* is directed to a schedule of programs to be recorded. After selecting the Schedule button, the user may remove or change programs on the record list by selecting the Remove or Change buttons, respectively. (*Ward et al.*, para. 0121.) The final Office Action (p. 4) appears to allege that this removal/change feature teaches “changing the IPG time listing characteristic”. Appellant disagrees.

The final Office Action alleges (p. 4) that the “look of the EPG/IPG time information displayed” discussed in Para. 0028 of *Ward et al.* corresponds to the claimed “an IPG time listing characteristic”. Appellant assumes (for the sake of argument) that this allegation is true. However, Appellant submits that removing or changing programs on the record list changes the content rather than the look of the EPG/IPG (using the language of the Office Action).

Therefore, *Ward et al.* does not teach “changing the IPG time listing characteristic”. Similarly, a user removing or changing a scheduled recording is best understood as user input requesting a change in the programs to be recorded, not user input requesting a change in the look of the EPG (“time listing characteristic”). Therefore, *Ward et al.* does not teach modifying “in accordance with the first user input” where claim 39 further defines “first user input” as “requesting a change in an interactive program guide (IPG) time listing characteristic”. Since the final Office Action has not shown that *Ward et al.* discloses, teaches, or suggests all elements of claim 39, the rejection should be overturned.

b. *Ward et al.* does not teach

“...wherein the IPG time listing characteristic is represented by an object indicia presented to a user and an action for reconfiguring the IPG time listing characteristic is represented by a tool indicia presented to the user such that a first user input of selecting the object indicia and the tool indicia modifies the IPG time listing characteristic”

The final Office Action alleges (p. 4) that the Schedule button (shown in FIG. 6) appearing on the action bar (ref. num. 20 in FIG. 1) of *Ward et al.* correspond to the claimed object indicia. The final Office Action also alleges (p. 3) that the Remove/Change buttons (shown in FIG. 6) appearing on the navigation bar (ref. num. 18 in FIG. 6) correspond to the claimed tool indicia. As discussed above in section VII.A.5.a, FIG. 6 of *Ward et al.* describes removing or changing the content of, rather than the look of the EPG/IPG (using the language of the Office Action).

Appellant assumes (for the sake of argument) that the schedule of recordings in FIG. 6 corresponds to an “IPG time listing”, and that the Watch/Record Schedule button is an object indicia. Even so, Appellant submits that the Watch/Record Schedule button represents the schedule itself, and not the look of the schedule – *i.e.*, the button represents the time listing, not the time listing characteristic. In contrast, claim 39 recites that the object indicia represents the IPG time listing characteristic.

Similarly, the Remove or Change button represents an action for reconfiguring the schedule itself, not an action for reconfiguring the look of the schedule – the time listing, not the time listing characteristic. In contrast, claim 39 recites that the tool indicia represents an action for reconfiguring the IPG channel listing characteristic. Since the final Office Action has not shown that *Ward et al.* discloses, teaches, or suggests all elements of claim 39, the rejection should be overturned.

7. Independent Claim 43

Appellant submits that claim 43 is not anticipated by *Ward et al.* for at least the following reasons. For a proper rejection of a claim under 35 U.S.C. §102, the cited reference must disclose, teach, or suggest all elements/features/steps of the claim at issue. See, e.g., *E.I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. v. Phillips Petroleum Co.*, 849 F.2d 1430, 7 U.S.P.Q.2d 1129 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

a. *Ward et al.* does not teach “receiving a first user input identifying an interactive program guide (IPG) channel listing characteristic”

It is unclear to Appellant which features in *Ward et al.* allegedly correspond to this feature, since the final Office Action did not provide any citations to *Ward et al.* for this particular feature. However, the final Office Action (p. 3) does refer to FIG. 1 and FIG. 6 of *Ward et al.* in discussing claim language which follows this feature (“wherein the IPG channel listing characteristic is represented...”). Therefore, Appellant assumes that the rejection applies FIGs. 1 and 6 of *Ward et al.* to this initial “receiving a first user input...” claim language also.

FIG. 6 of *Ward et al.* is directed to a schedule of programs to be recorded. After selecting the Schedule button, the user may remove or change programs on the record list by selecting the Remove or Change buttons, respectively. (*Ward et al.*, para. 0121.) The final Office Action (p. 4) appears to allege that this removal/change feature teaches “receiving a first user input identifying an interactive program guide (IPG) channel listing characteristic”.

Appellant disagrees.

The final Office Action alleges (p. 3) that the “look of the EPG/IPG information displayed” discussed in Para. 0028 of *Ward et al.* corresponds to the claimed “IPG channel listing characteristic”. Appellant assumes (for the sake of argument) that this allegation is true. However, Appellant submits that a user removing or changing a scheduled recording is best understood as user input requesting a change in the programs to be recorded, not user input identifying an aspect of the look of the EPG (“a channel listing characteristic”). Since the final Office Action has not shown that *Ward et al.* discloses, teaches, or suggests all elements of claim 43, the rejection should be overturned.

b. *Ward et al.* does not teach

“...wherein the IPG channel listing characteristic is represented by an object indicia presented to a user and an action for reconfiguring the IPG channel listing characteristic is represented by a tool indicia presented to the user such that a first user input of selecting the object indicia and the tool indicia modifies the IPG channel listing characteristic”

The final Office Action alleges (p. 3) that the Schedule button (shown in FIG. 6) appearing on the action bar (ref. num. 20 in FIG. 1) of *Ward et al.* correspond to the claimed object indicia. The final Office Action also alleges (p. 3) that the Remove/Change buttons (shown in FIG. 6) appearing on the navigation bar (ref. num. 18 in FIG. 6) correspond to the claimed tool indicia. As discussed above in section VII.A.7.a, FIG. 6 of *Ward et al.* describes removing or changing the content of, rather than the look of the EPG/IPG (using the language of the Office Action).

Appellant assumes (for the sake of argument) that the schedule of recordings in FIG. 6 corresponds to an “IPG channel listing”, and that the Watch/Record Schedule button is an object indicia. Even so, Appellant submits that the Watch/Record Schedule button represents the schedule itself, and not the look of the schedule – *i.e.*, the button represents the channel listing, not the channel listing characteristic. In contrast, claim 43 recites that the object indicia represents the IPG channel listing characteristic.

Similarly, the Remove or Change button represents an action for reconfiguring the schedule itself, not an action for reconfiguring the look of the schedule – the channel listing, not the channel listing characteristic. In contrast, claim 43 recites that the tool indicia represents an action for reconfiguring the IPG channel listing characteristic. Since the final Office Action has not shown that *Ward et al.* discloses, teaches, or suggests all elements of claim 43, the rejection should be overturned.

8. Independent Claim 51

Appellant submits that claim 51 is not anticipated by *Ward et al.* for at least the following reasons. For a proper rejection of a claim under 35 U.S.C. §102, the cited reference must disclose, teach, or suggest all elements/features/steps of the claim at issue. See, e.g., *E.I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. v. Phillips Petroleum Co.*, 849 F.2d 1430, 7 U.S.P.Q.2d 1129 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

a. *Ward et al.* does not teach “receiving a first user input identifying an interactive program guide (IPG) time listing characteristic”

It is unclear to Appellant which features in *Ward et al.* allegedly correspond to this feature, since the final Office Action did not provide any citations to *Ward et al.* for this particular feature. However, the final Office Action (p. 4) does refer to FIG. 1 and FIG. 6 of *Ward et al.* in discussing claim language which follows this feature (“wherein the IPG time listing characteristic is represented...”). Therefore, Appellant assumes that the rejection applies FIGs. 1 and 6 of *Ward et al.* to this initial “receiving a first user input...” claim language also.

FIG. 6 of *Ward et al.* is directed to a schedule of programs to be recorded. After selecting the Schedule button, the user may remove or change programs on the record list by selecting the Remove or Change buttons, respectively. (*Ward et al.*, para. 0121.) The final Office Action (p. 4) appears to allege that this removal/change feature teaches “receiving a first user input identifying an interactive program guide (IPG) time listing characteristic”. Appellant disagrees.

The final Office Action alleges (p. 4) that the “look of the EPG/IPG time information displayed” discussed in Para. 0028 of *Ward et al.* corresponds to the claimed “IPG time listing characteristic”. Appellant assumes (for the sake of argument) that this allegation is true. However, Appellant submits that a user removing or changing a scheduled recording is best understood as user input requesting a change in the programs to be recorded, not user input identifying an aspect of the look of the EPG (“a time listing characteristic”). Since the final Office Action has not shown that *Ward et al.* discloses, teaches, or suggests all elements of claim 51, the rejection should be overturned.

b. *Ward et al.* does not teach

“...wherein the IPG time listing characteristic is represented by an object indicia presented to a user and an action for reconfiguring the IPG time listing characteristic is represented by a tool indicia presented to the user such that a first user input of selecting the object indicia and the tool indicia modifies the IPG time listing characteristic”

The final Office Action alleges (p. 4) that the Schedule button (shown in FIG. 6) appearing on the action bar (ref. num. 20 in FIG. 1) of *Ward et al.* correspond to the claimed object indicia. The final Office Action also alleges (p. 3) that the Remove/Change buttons (shown in FIG. 6) appearing on the navigation bar (ref. num. 18 in FIG. 6) correspond to the claimed tool indicia. As discussed above in section VII.A.5.a, FIG. 6 of *Ward et al.* describes removing or changing the content of, rather than the look of the EPG/IPG (using the language of the Office Action).

Appellant assumes (for the sake of argument) that the schedule of recordings in FIG. 6 corresponds to an “IPG time listing”, and that the Watch/Record Schedule button is an object indicia. Even so, Appellant submits that the Watch/Record Schedule button represents the schedule itself, and not the look of the schedule – *i.e.*, the button represents the time listing, not the time listing characteristic. In contrast, claim 51 recites that the object indicia represents the IPG time listing characteristic.

Similarly, the Remove or Change button represents an action for reconfiguring the schedule itself, not an action for reconfiguring the look of the schedule – *i.e.*, the button represents the time listing, not the time listing characteristic. In contrast, claim 51 recites that the tool indicia represents an action for reconfiguring the IPG channel listing characteristic. Since the final Office Action has not shown that *Ward et al.* discloses, teaches, or suggests all elements of claim 51, the rejection should be overturned.

9. Claims 2-3, 10-14, 18-23, 31-36, 44-48, and 55-74

Since independent claims 1, 6, 17, 26, 30, 39, 43, and 51 are allowable, Appellant submits that claims 2-3, 10-14, 18-23, 31-36, 44-48, and 55-74 are allowable for at least the reason that each depends from an allowable claim. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Therefore, Appellant requests that the rejection of claims 2-3, 10-14, 18-23, 31-36, 44-48, and 55-74 be overturned.

B. Rejection of Claims 15 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103: *Ward et al.* and *Lemmons et al.*

Lemmons et al. does not cure the deficiency of *Ward et al.* discussed above in connection with independent claim 1. Since independent claim 1 is allowable for at least the reasons discussed above, Appellant submits that claims 15 and 16 are allowable for at least the reason that each depends from an allowable claim. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Therefore, Appellant requests that the rejection of claims 15 and 16 be overturned.

C. Conclusion

For at least the reasons discussed above, Appellant respectfully requests that the Examiner's final rejection of claims 1-3, 6, 10-23, 26, 30-36, 39, 43-48, 51 and 57-74 be overturned by the Board, and that the application be allowed to issue as a patent with pending claims 1-3, 6, 10-23, 26, 30-36, 39, 43-48, 51 and 57-74.

Section IX included herein indicates that no additional evidence is relied on in this brief. Section X included herein indicates that Appellant is not aware of any related proceedings.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Karen G. Hazzah/

Karen G. Hazzah, Reg. No. 48,472

**THOMAS, KAYDEN, HORSTEMEYER
& RISLEY, L.L.P.**

600 Galleria Parkway, SE
Suite 1500
Atlanta, Georgia 30339-5948
Tel: (770) 933-9500
Fax: (770) 951-0933

VIII. CLAIMS – APPENDIX

1. A system for providing interactive media services comprising:
memory for storing interactive program guide (IPG) configuration data that is used to determine an IPG channel listing characteristic where the channel listing characteristic comprises a predetermined number of channels presented concurrently; and
logic configured to modify the IPG configuration data in response to a first user input requesting a change in the IPG channel listing characteristic,
wherein the IPG channel listing characteristic is represented by an object indicia presented to a user and an action for reconfiguring the IPG channel listing characteristic is represented by a tool indicia presented to the user such that a first user input of selecting the object indicia and the tool indicia modifies the IPG channel listing characteristic.
2. The system of claim 1, where the memory is non-volatile memory.
3. The system of claim 1, where an IPG screen that is configured in accordance with the first user input is presented to the user in response to receiving a second user input.
6. A system for providing interactive media services comprising:
memory for storing interactive program guide (IPG) configuration data that is used to determine an IPG time listing characteristic where the time listing characteristic is at least one of the following:
a predetermined number of time listings presented concurrently and a predetermined coverage of a time listing; and
logic configured to modify the IPG configuration data in response to a first user input requesting a change in the IPG time listing characteristic,
wherein the IPG time listing characteristic is represented by an object indicia presented to a user and an action for reconfiguring the IPG time listing characteristic is represented by a

tool indicia presented to the user such that a first user input of selecting the object indicia and the tool indicia modifies the IPG time listing characteristic.

10. The system of claim 1, where an IPG screen that is configured in accordance with the first user input is presented to the user via a display device.

11. The system of claim 10, where the display device is a television.

12. The system of claim 1, where the first user input is provided via a remote control device.

13. The system of claim 1, where the system is a client device.

14. The system of claim 13, where the client device is a digital home communication terminal (DHCT).

15. The system of claim 1, where the system is a server device.

16. The system of claim 15, where the server device is located at a headend.

17. A method for configuring a user interface, comprising:
receiving a first user input requesting a change in an interactive program guide (IPG) channel listing characteristic where the channel listing characteristic comprises a predetermined number of channels presented concurrently; and
modifying IPG configuration data stored in memory in response to receiving the first user input, where the IPG configuration data is used to determine the IPG channel listing characteristic,

wherein the IPG channel listing characteristic is represented by an object indicia presented to a user and an action for reconfiguring the IPG channel listing characteristic is

represented by a tool indicia presented to the user such that a first user input of selecting the object indicia and the tool indicia modifies the IPG channel listing characteristic.

18. The method of claim 17, where the first user input is provided via a remote control device.

19. The method of claim 17, further comprising:
providing a user with an IPG screen that is configured in accordance with the IPG configuration data that is modified in response to the first user input.

20. The method of claim 19, where the IPG screen is presented to the user in response to receiving a second user input.

21. The method of claim 20, where the second user input is received while the user is not being presented with an IPG screen.

22. The method of claim 19, where the IPG screen is presented to the user via a display device.

23. The method of claim 22, where the display device is a television.

26. A method for configuring a user interface, comprising:
receiving a first user input requesting a change in an interactive program guide (IPG) time listing characteristic where the time listing characteristic is at least one of the following:
a predetermined number of time listings presented concurrently and a predetermined coverage of a time listing; and
modifying IPG configuration data stored in memory in response to receiving the first user input, where the IPG configuration data is used to determine the IPG time listing characteristic,

wherein the IPG time listing characteristic is represented by an object indicia presented to a user and an action for reconfiguring the IPG time listing characteristic is represented by a tool indicia presented to the user such that a first user input of selecting the object indicia and the tool indicia modifies the IPG time listing characteristic.

30. A method for configuring a user interface, comprising:

receiving a first user input requesting a change in an interactive program guide (IPG) channel listing characteristic, where the channel listing characteristic comprises a predetermined number of channels presented concurrently; and

changing the IPG channel listing characteristic in accordance with the first user input, wherein the IPG channel listing characteristic is represented by an object indicia presented to a user and an action for reconfiguring the IPG channel listing characteristic is represented by a tool indicia presented to the user such that a first user input of selecting the object indicia and the indicia modifies the IPG channel listing characteristic.

31. The method of claim 30, where the first user input is provided via a remote control device.

32. The method of claim 30, further comprising:
providing the user with an IPG screen that is configured in accordance with the first user input.

33. The method of claim 32, where the IPG screen is presented to the user in response to receiving a second user input.

34. The method of claim 33, where the second user input is received while the user is not being presented with an IPG screen.

35. The method of claim 32, where the IPG screen is presented to the user via a display device.

36. The method of claim 35, where the display device is a television.

39. A method for configuring a user interface, comprising:
receiving a first user input requesting a change in an interactive program guide (IPG) time listing characteristic, where the time listing characteristic is at least one of the following:
a predetermined number of time listings presented concurrently and a predetermined coverage of a time listing; and
changing the IPG time listing characteristic in accordance with the first user input,
wherein the IPG time listing characteristic is represented by an object indicia presented to a user and an action for reconfiguring the IPG time listing characteristic is represented by a tool indicia presented to the user such that a first user input of selecting the object indicia and the tool indicia modifies the IPG time listing characteristic.

43. A method for configuring a user interface, comprising:
receiving a first user input identifying an interactive program guide (IPG) channel listing characteristic, where the channel listing characteristic comprises a predetermined number of channels presented concurrently; and
providing the user with an IPG screen that has the characteristic identified via the first user input,
wherein the IPG channel listing characteristic is represented by an object indicia presented to a user and an action for reconfiguring the IPG channel listing characteristic is represented by a tool indicia presented to the user such that a first user input of selecting the object indicia and the indicia modifies the IPG channel listing characteristic.

44. The method of claim 43, where the first user input is provided via a remote control device.

45. The method of claim 43, where the IPG screen is presented to the user in response to receiving a second user input.

46. The method of claim 45, where the second user input is received while the user is not being presented with an IPG screen.

47. The method of claim 43, where the IPG screen is presented to the user via a display device.

48. The method of claim 47, where the display device is a television.

51. A method for configuring a user interface, comprising:
receiving a first user input identifying an interactive program guide (IPG) time listing characteristic, where the time listing characteristic is at least one of the following:
a predetermined number of time listings presented concurrently and a predetermined coverage of a time listing; and
providing the user with an IPG screen that has the characteristic identified via the first user input,

wherein the IPG time listing characteristic is represented by an object indicia presented to a user and an action for reconfiguring the IPG time listing characteristic is represented by a tool indicia presented to the user such that a first user input of selecting the object indicia and the tool indicia modifies the IPG time listing characteristic.

55. The system of claim 1, wherein the object indicia and the tool indicia are presented as symbols to the user.

56. The system of claim 1, wherein the object indicia and the tool indicia are presented as menu options on at least one screen to the user.

57. The system of claim 1, wherein the object indicia and the tool indicia are presented on a request screen responsive to the user input.

58. The system of claim 6, wherein the object indicia and the tool indicia are presented as symbols to the user.

59. The system of claim 6, wherein the object indicia and the tool indicia are presented as menu options on at least one screen to the user.

60. The system of claim 6, wherein the object indicia and the tool indicia are presented on a request screen responsive to the user input.

61. The method of claim 17, wherein the object indicia and the tool indicia are presented as symbols to the user.

62. The method of claim 17, wherein the object indicia and the tool indicia are presented as menu options on at least one screen to the user.

63. The method of claim 17, wherein the object indicia and the tool indicia are presented on a request screen responsive to the user input.

64. The method of claim 26, wherein the object indicia and the tool indicia are presented as symbols to the user.

65. The method of claim 26, wherein the object indicia and the tool indicia are presented as menu options on at least one screen to the user.

66. The method of claim 26, wherein the object indicia and the tool indicia are presented on a request screen responsive to the user input.

67. The method of claim 30, wherein the object indicia and the tool indicia are presented as symbols to the user.

68. The method of claim 30, wherein the object indicia and the tool indicia are presented as menu options on at least one screen to the user.

69. The method of claim 39, wherein the object indicia and the tool indicia are presented as symbols to the user.

70. The method of claim 39, wherein the object indicia and the tool indicia are presented as menu options on at least one screen to the user.

71. The method of claim 43, wherein the object indicia and the tool indicia are presented as symbols to the user.

72. The method of claim 43, wherein the object indicia and the tool indicia are presented as menu options on at least one screen to the user.

73. The method of claim 51, wherein the object indicia and the tool indicia are presented as symbols to the user.

74. The method of claim 51, wherein the object indicia and the tool indicia are presented as menu options on at least one screen to the user.

IX. EVIDENCE – APPENDIX

None.

X. RELATED PROCEEDINGS – APPENDIX

None.